

ROUGE ET NOIR.

CONTENTS.

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Socialism— <i>Exon.</i>	3
Mar Saba— <i>Trefoil.</i>	5
Imperial Federation— <i>Bohemian.</i>	6
The Hydah Indians.	8
After Antietam.— <i>Rajah.</i>	9
POETRY.	
An Old Story— <i>J. F. A. W.</i>	8
EDITORIALS.	10
CRICKET.	11
EXCHANGE COLUMN	13
PERSONALS	13
ABOUT COLLEGE.	12

SOCIALISM.

II.

From what has already been said, it should be evident how unfair it is to endeavour to dismiss the subject by declaring, for example, that Socialism seeks to abolish all private capital, to confiscate all private property, and to blot out all individuality of character. Of course Socialism has certain teachings on these points somewhat at variance with the selfish individualism now rampant, but in reality they are far removed from any such sweeping assertions as the above. Socialists believe, with Mr. Ruskin, that it is impossible for an individual to amass a large fortune honestly, without in some way unduly taxing the labour of other men, or profiting by fraudulent or dishonourable transactions. Under the present conditions of inequality, therefore, many recommend the imposition of a heavy progressive income tax, and think the government is justified in interfering in the relations between labour and capital. The principle of the cumulative taxation is already recognized in most countries, in as much as incomes under a certain amount are not taxed at all, and it does seem reasonable that the stronger man should bear the heavier burden for the general welfare of the community. In India the system of taxation enforced by the Imperial Government, has lately undergone some changes to further realize the idea of a progressive income tax. Again it is thought desirable by some Socialistic schools of economy, that great national

industries should be worked for the profit of the nation as a whole. Here it must be borne in mind that such a "revolution" has been, and might again be effected, without any robbery or other injustice, and that it is a mere question of expediency either one way or the other. The English Government has taken over the telegraphic enterprise, and the Imperial Government of Germany has assumed control of the railway system, and the Chancellor has just brought forward a scheme for a government "Schnapps monopoly." In each case the change has been effected peaceably and constitutionally.

Socialists, who are thorough collectivists, advocate the assumption by the State of all the instruments of production, but this section by no means represents the most influential force in the Socialistic body. Many of the Christian Socialists, on the other hand, lay down a fundamental rule to the effect that "the state is neither capitalist, nor producer, nor director of works, but its mission everywhere is simply to guarantee rights."

As for personal property the fullest use, consistent with the rights of others, would be allowed to the individual who produces any wealth by his own exertions, yet a distinction is made in regard to inheritances and bequests, for the receivers of such do not possess the same rights as the original creators of the property. This fact, also, is even now accepted in part, seeing that a government tax is placed on all legacies and the conveyance of property. And though Socialism lays great stress upon the social bond and inculcates the duty of living more for others, it by no means seeks to efface individuality. Nay, rather it spurs on the wholesome ambition of the separate units of society to perfect both themselves and the race by their unselfish strivings for the common weal. Socialists recognize the fact that the community depends upon the individuals composing it, and therefore believe that "in rendering these individuals perfect lies the whole principle and aim of society." Nor do they look for a communistic equivalence in respect of education, profession, or station in life. Different classes, defined not by birth but by merit alone, would be quite consistent with a Socialistic state, and remuneration would be awarded according to the deserts of the person concerned. The idea of paying an equal price for bad as for good work is Communistic, and abhorrent to the "proportionate equality" advocated by true Socialism.